



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMMR_7161
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Transitions in Employment, Ability and Motivation (STREAM): The design of a four-year longitudinal cohort study among 15,118 persons aged 45 to 64 years
Type of the Article	Study Protocols

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript has been submitted under Study Protocol category. Study Protocols are submitted before the implementation or at very early stage of implementation of a project and the document uses future tense most of the time. In the manuscript, documentation is carried out in mixed tenses (past & future). 2. At some places references are missing; for example: at lines: 41, 50, 122,123, 124,174 (Following WHO definition....) 3. There seems correlation and overlap among different potential determinants and moderating factors (health and age; skills and age; skills and knowledge and education; social factors and education; financial factors and education). It would be good if authors could elaborate they would address these correlation/multicollinearity. 4. Overall, there is a need to address the language gaps and editing of the manuscript. <p><u>Methods</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The objectives of the study state the age bracket as 45-64 years while the sample size is 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We checked the use of past and future tense in the manuscript and ensured that everything that took place already was written in the past sense, while activities in future are written in future tense. 2. We added a number of references to substantiate our reasoning. 3. We agree that there will be some overlap in potential determinants. This is now addressed in the manuscript. Wherever possible, these determinants will be examined together. We do not anticipate problematic multicollinearity among the determinants and moderating factors, but will check for multicollinearity in future analyses. This is now mentioned in the new section 2.5 4. Spaces in the manuscript have apparently been deleted when converting the manuscript to an older version of Word. We try to avoid this by saving our revised manuscript as a Word 2003 (.doc) file. <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. We now describe more clearly why we focused on this outcome in the power



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>calculated for participants of 60-63 years age. This would exclude participants of age less than 60 years and would never achieve the objective. The authors need to revise the objectives or provide rationale for this discrepancy between objective and sample size.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Again, this is a Study Protocol where results are waited for but in this manuscript the results are presented. Usually, dummy tables are provided in Study Protocol. The authors should modify the manuscript accordingly. 7. Please explain why different number of questions were asked from the participants with different employment status (employees, self employed, non-employed) ; will it affect the comparison; how would the authors address this issue? 8. Consent was obtained for linking the data. Please state whether consent was obtained for interview or not? If obtained, it should be mentioned. 9. Please elaborate how will you manage data and perform analysis? Which statistical program will be used? 	<p>analysis. For most of our research questions we do need the full age range of 45-64 years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. We do not believe that dummy tables for the main research questions will be informative. This would result in large tables with regression analyses of several outcome variables and a great number of potential determinants, mediators and moderating variables. We believe descriptive results of the main transitions in employment in the three available waves of data are more informative. 7. Wherever possible, identical questions were asked of participants with different employment status. However, we also asked more specific questions that were only relevant for individuals in a certain employment status. For example, non-employed persons cannot answer questions about working conditions. This is more clearly described in the Methods-section. 8. Consent was indeed obtained for interviews. This is now mentioned. 9. Information on data management and statistical analyses are added in section 2.5.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methods 1. It would be good if the formula or the software which was used for calculating this sample size is provided. 2. References should not be too old. Some of the references are very old, 36, 38 & 41.	1. A reference for the power analysis is now provided. 2. We do not agree. These references concern the original scales and user guides of questionnaires that are included in the STREAM, and are widely used in research.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		